DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 067 UD 022 246

TITLE	Title I Children's Program: Learning to Read through the Arts. Final Evaluation Report, 1980-1981.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[81]
NOTE	44p.; For a related document, see ED 189 238. Prepared by the Ancillary Services Evaluation Unit.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Aesthetic Education; *Art Education; Compensatory Education; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Cooperation; Elementary Education; *Integrated Activities; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Reading Difficulties; *Reading Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Learning to Read Through the Arts Program; National Diffusion Network; New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This is a 1980-81 evaluation report on Learning to Read Through the Arts (L.T.R.T.A.), a Title I Children's Program in place in the New York City Public Schools. The program, which offered intensive individualized reading instruction through the integration of a total arts program with a total reading program, served elementary school children, including some special education students, who were reading at least 1 year below grade level. The report presents the results of program evaluation in four components: (1) assessment of reading achievement of 1,066 regular students; (2) assessment of reading achievement of 94 special education students; (3) assessment of communications efforts between L.T.R.T.A. program staff and teachers in students' sending classes; and (4) analysis of the impact of the L.T.R.T.A. program's involvement in the National Diffusion Network (NDN), a system supported by the U.S. Department of Education to provide assistance to educational programs in materials acquisition and in the incorporation of improved practices in programs. Descriptions of programs and recommendations based on evaluation results are presented. (Author/MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215067

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Project Number: 5001-48-11640

TITLE I CHILDREN'S PROGRAM:

LEARNING TO READ THROUGH
THE ARTS, 1980-1981

Project Director: Bernadette O'Brien

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Prepared By The
ANCILLARY SERVICES EVALUATION UNIT

Sharon Walker, Manager

Istar Schwager, Consultant
Diane Grodinsky, Consultant

UD 022 246

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

Richard Guttenberg, Chief Administrator

A SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION
FOR THE
1980-1981 LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS PROGRAM

Learning To Read Through the Arts (L.T.R.T.A.), a Title I Children's Program, offers intensive individualized reading instruction through the integration of a total arts program with a total reading program. In 1980-1981, the program served 1,160 children from all five boroughs who were reading at least one year below grade level, including 94 special education students. Most of the students were in grades four to six, although grades two and three were included at the Staten Island site.

Students participated in two reading-oriented arts workshops which used the areas of theater arts, fine arts, and/or music to emphasize listening, speaking, writing, and reading skills. They also attended a reading workshop which employed a diagnostic-prescriptive approach to reading through individual and small group instruction. The workshops were closely coordinated.

In addition, the program's association with various museums, (the Queens Museum, the Bronx Museum of the Arts, the Brooklyn Museum, and the Staten Island Children's Museum) the Ballet Hispanico of New York, and the New York Aquarium, provided students with field trips to view exhibitions and performances culminating in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Exhibition, Performing Arts, and Film Festival. All children participated in this event.

Parental involvement was also an important part of the L.T.R.T.A. program. Parents were encouraged to participate in hands-on activities and in workshops geared to developing their understanding of how children learn and how to help them at home.

The evaluation of L.T.R.T.A. in 1980-1981 included four components: 1) assessment of reading achievement of 1,066 regular students; 2) assessment of reading achievement of 94 special education students; 3) assessment of communications efforts between L.T.R.T.A. program staff and students' sending school teachers; and 4) analysis of the L.T.R.T.A. staffs' reactions to specific National Diffusion Network Activities. Each of these is summarized below.

The California Achievement Test was used to measure changes in reading levels of the 1,066 regular students. The evaluation objective was a mean gain score of five N.C.E.'s, the criterion for success in Title I programs. The L.T.R.T.A. students attained an average gain of 13 N.C.E.'s; this indicates that L.T.R.T.A. was very effective in improving students' reading skills.

The special education component was similar in procedures and content for the 94 students involved. The differences were a smaller class size, the participation of entire classes and their classroom teachers, and the use of a different test to measure achievement. The Wisconsin Design Skill Development Test, a criterion-referenced test, was used to assess mastery in four skill areas: comprehension, phonetic analysis, structural analysis, and vocabulary. The evaluation results show that students far surpassed expected objectives

(60 percent were expected to pass four objectives) with 88 percent of the students passing four objectives and 82 percent of the students passing five objectives, which they had failed to master on the pretest.

Observations in a sample of 11 classrooms indicated the following about the efforts of L.T.R.T.A. staff to increase communications between the program and sending schools' classroom teachers. 1) Teachers of regular students were hesitant to carry-over L.T.R.T.A. program methodology into their classrooms because not all the students participated in the program. 2) Teachers of special education students were more likely to carry-over L.T.R.T.A.

The L.T.R.T.A. program has been nationally validated since 1975 and has received funding from the National Diffusion Network (N.D.N.) of the United States Department of Education as a successful program which can be transferred to other schools and districts around the country. A questionnaire distributed to all L.T.R.T.A. teachers reveals that the dissemination materials developed with N.D.N. funding were helpful in their training. A large percentage of respondents reported numerous outside visitors to their classrooms, and many teachers felt that teaching at a developer/demonstator site was professionally rewarding.

The major recommendations resulting from the L.T.R.T.A. program evaluation are the following.

- The program should be continued and possibly expanded to accommodate some of the eligible students now on a waiting list.
- Program staff may wish to consider ways of expanding the program further to serve bilingual or nonpublic school students.
- Where possible, it is recommended that entire classes and their teachers participate in the program to ensure maximum carry-over of program goals.
- Strategies should be explored for minimizing time and effort spent establishing and transferring sites at the beginning of the year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
SUMMARY		i
List of Tables		iv
Chapter		
I.	EVALUATION ABSTRACT: LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS	1
II.	RESULTS OF EVALUATION	
	Program Description	3
	Evaluation Results	5
III.	EVALUATION ABSTRACT: SPECIAL EDUCATION COMPONENT	9
IV.	RESULTS OF EVALUATION	
	Program Description	11
	Evaluation Results	12
V.	COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN L.T.R.T.A. STAFF AND CLASSROOM TEACHERS	
	Communications Objectives	13
	Assessment Procedures	14
	Assessment Results	14
VI.	IMPACT OF INVOLVEMENT IN THE NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK	
	Background	17
	Management, Materials, and Staff Expertise	18
	Networking with New York City Institutions	20
	Assessment of Staff Skills and Morale	20
VII.	RECOMMENDATIONS	23
VIII.	APPENDICES	25
	A. Site Visit Observation Form	26
	B. National Diffusion Network Questionnaire and Results	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	California Achievement Test, Pretest/Posttest Means in N.C.E.'s	7
2	Frequency Distribution of N.C.E. Scores on Pretests and Posttests, by Quartile For All Participants Taking Both Pretest and Posttest	8

I. EVALUATION ABSTRACT

PROGRAM: Title I Children's Program: Learning to Read Through the Arts

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER: 5001-48-11640

FUNDING PERIOD: September, 1980-June, 1981

FUNDING SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education

BUDGET: $819,523*

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN PROGRAM: (FULL YEAR)

# pretested	1160
# posttested	840
# pre- and posttested	840

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS: Students in grades two to six reading at least one year below grade level.

NUMBER OF SITES: Five.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS: One site each in Bronx, Queens, Manhattan, Staten Island, and Brooklyn. Students were bused to borough sites two afternoons a week except in Staten Island, where children attended the program in their own school. At each site, there were two concurrent week cycles, two days per week. Students attended the program eight hours per week.

MAJOR PROGRAM COMPONENTS: During each session, students participated in two reading-oriented arts workshops where they received instruction in reading and art. They also received three hours of individualized directed reading instruction each week in a reading workshop. Monthly field trips and a special end-of-year exhibition and performance were featured.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE: A mean gain of five N.C.E.'s from pretest to posttest scores.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS: California Achievement Test in reading, form C, levels 11-16.

TYPE OF INSTRUMENT: Norm-referenced test.

TEST DATES: October, 1980, and May, 1981.

*Includes budget for special education component.

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES: Pretest/posttest comparisons were made in accordance with Model A for Title I programs. The treatment effect was determined by comparing mean pretest N.C.E.'s with posttest N.C.E.'s.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS:

Overall Treatment Effect = 13.0 N.C.E.'s

Grade 2 Treatment Effect = 14.6 N.C.E.'s

Grade 3 Treatment Effect = 15.7 N.C.E.'s

Grade 4 Treatment Effect = 15.0 N.C.E.'s

Grade 5 Treatment Effect = 11.7 N.C.E.'s

Grade 6 Treatment Effect = 10.0 N.C.E.'s

OBJECTIVE MET: The program surpassed the criterion for program success.

II. TITLE I CHILDREN'S PROGRAM: LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Title I Children's Program: Learning to Read Through the Arts (L.T.R.T.A.) is an intensive, individualized reading program that focuses on the improvement of reading skills through the integration of a total arts program with a total reading program. In the school year 1980-1981, the program was offered for two concurrent 29-week cycles from October, 1980, to June, 1981. Two afternoons a week, Title I eligible children in the Bronx, Queens, Manhattan and Brooklyn were bused to a program site in their borough. Each of these boroughs served 240 students. In Staten Island, where the program was held in their schools, two afternoons a week, 220 children participated. A total of 1,160 children participated in the program, including 94 special education students. Evaluation results for special education students appear in Sections III and IV of this report.

Except in Staten Island, the program was offered to fourth, fifth and sixth graders who were between 9 and 12 years old and who were reading at least one year below grade level. In Staten Island, children in grades two to six who were reading a year below grade level were eligible for the program. The program was scheduled for 12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. at all sites except Staten Island, where it was scheduled for 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

At each program site, students participated in two reading-oriented arts workshops where listening, speaking, writing, and reading skills were emphasized. These workshops offered dance, theater, music, painting, sculpture, graphics, printmaking, mixed media, ceramics, and photography. As part of each workshop language was integrated with art by students recording the

day's language experiences in their individual writing journals, while the workshop leader recorded this information in a master journal. These experiences included the learning of specialized vocabulary, norm-referenced vocabulary, reading skills, creative writing, and reading for information, appreciation, and/or pleasure.

In addition, students participated in a reading workshop which used a diagnostic-prescriptive approach to reading and emphasized individual and small group instruction. Each student received at least three hours of reading instruction per week. The reading workshops focused on comprehension, word attack skills, study skills, and reading for appreciation and/or pleasure. The reading-oriented arts workshops and the reading workshops were closely coordinated.

Field trips were an integral part of the program. The program is associated with the Bronx Museum of the Arts, the Brooklyn Museum, the Queens Museum, the Staten Island Children's Museum, Ballet Hispanico of New York, and the New York Aquarium. One day each month was set aside for field trips to museums, galleries, art and educational resource centers, and libraries to view exhibitions and performances. For the second year, children performed in the Macy's City Kids Event, at Macy's Herald Square in New York City.

The Learning to Read Through the Arts Exhibition, Performing Arts, and Film Festival represented the culmination of the year's activities. The main exhibition was held at the School of Visual Arts Museum in New York; concommitantly, exhibitions and performances were held at the five Learning to Read Through the Arts Centers as part of this major final event. All children participated in this event.

Parent workshops were held at each site for 90 minutes a week for

ten weeks. The workshops, which were conducted by the assistant coordinators and a social worker, focused on how children learn and on family life education. Parents also participated in hands-on activities geared to teaching them about the program. The workshops also offered suggestions on how parents could help their children with reading at home. Parents were invited to observe their children's workshops.

EVALUATION RESULTS

The program objective was for students in the program to achieve a mean gain of five Normal Curve Equivalents (N.C.E.'s) on the California Achievement Test in reading.* Pretest and posttest data were analyzed using Model A of the U.S. Department of Education's recommended approaches for Title I evaluations.**

According to this norm-referenced model, it is expected that without treatment, a student's percentile on a pretest will remain the same on a posttest, i.e., under no-treatment conditions, a student is expected to remain in the same position, relative to other students, on both pretest and posttest. If the percentile status on the posttest is greater than on the pretest, gain can be attributed to the effectiveness of the program. The User's Guide stipulates that gains are to be reported in N.C.E.'s, which are based on an equal interval scale. N.C.E.'s match the precentile ranks of the distribution of

*The L.T.R.T.A. evaluation testing program was administered at the student's functional level, at pretest (October, 1980) and posttest (May, 1981). As part of the Citywide Testing Program, students were administered an alternative form of the CAT in April, 1981. The Citywide Testing Program is administered at the student's instructional (grade) level.

**See G.K. Tallmadge, et al., User's Guide: ESEA Title I Evaluation and Reporting System. Mountain View, California: RMC Research Corp. (Prepared for U.S. Department of Education), Revised February, 1981

of a nationally representative sample of students.

The California Achievement Test, form C, levels 11-16, in reading, was used to assess student reading improvement. The California Achievement Test is a standardized, norm-referenced test.

The students in L.T.R.T.A. not only surpassed the criterion for success set for Title I programs, they gained 13 N.C.E.'s. The mean pretest score for students in the program was 27 N.C.E.'s, while the mean posttest score was 40 N.C.E.'s. (see Tables 1 and 2.) These scores indicate considerable improvement in participants' reading skills, both overall and for each grade level.

TABLE 1

California Achievement Test, Pretest/Posttest Means in N.C.E.'s

For Participants Taking both Tests

Grade	Number of Students	Pretest N.C.E.	Posttest N.C.E.	Mean Gain
Second	64	36.3	50.9	14.6
Third	39	30.4	46.1	15.7
Fourth	294	24.1	39.1	15.0
Fifth	306	27.4	39.2	11.8
Sixth	137	26.7	36.7	10.0
Grades two to six	840	27.0	40.0	13.0

TABLE 2

Frequency Distribution of N.C.E. Scores on Pre- and Posttests by Quartile

For All Participants Taking Both Pretest and Posttest

Grade	Pretest Distribution by Quartile								Posttest Distribution by Quartile							
	1-25		26-50		51-75		76-99		1-25		26-50		51-75		76-99	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Second (n=64)	12	19%	44	69%	8	12%	-	-	-	-	37	58%	24	37%	3	5%
Third (n=39)	14	36	21	54	4	10	-	-	2	5%	23	59	12	31	2	5
Fourth (n=294)	164	56	124	42	5	1.7	1	.3	44	15	199	68	48	16	3	1
Fifth (n=306)	116	38	184	60	6	2	-	-	32	10	236	78	34	11	4	1
Sixth (n=137)	63	46	73	53	1	1	-	-	31	23	94	68	12	9		
All Grades (n=840)	369	44%	446	53%	24	2.9%	1	.3	109	13%	589	70%	130	15%	12	2%

III. EVALUATION ABSTRACT

PROGRAM: SPECIAL EDUCATION COMPONENT

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER: 5001-62-01636

FUNDING PERIOD: September, 1980-June, 1981

FUNDING SOURCE: U.S Department of Education

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN PROGRAM: (FULL YEAR)

# pretested	94
# posttested	94

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS: 94 special education students from classes in Queens and Staten Island.

NUMBER OF SITES: Two.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS: Queens special education classes with the classroom teachers were bused to the site in Queens one day a week; in Staten Island, the special education classes and teachers were at the site in their home school one day a week.

MAJOR PROGRAM COMPONENTS: Students participated in two reading-oriented art workshops and one reading workshop each Friday. They took regular field trips and participated in the annual exhibition and performing arts festival.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE: Sixty percent of the students will master four instructional objectives at posttest which they had not mastered at pretest.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT: Wisconsin Design Skill Development Test, forms P and Q, levels A, B, C, and D.

TYPE OF INSTRUMENT: Criterion-referenced test.

TEST DATES: Tests administered throughout the year.

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES: Computation of percentage of students mastering each instructional objective.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS:

Eighty-eight percent of the students passed at least four objectives.
Eighty-two percent of the students passed at least five objectives.
Fifty-three percent of the students passed at least six objectives.

OBJECTIVE MET:

The objective was surpassed.

IV. SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The following section of this report presents the evaluation data for 94* special education students from the boroughs of Queens and Staten Island who participated in the L.T.R.T.A. program. The special education students in Queens and Staten Island participated in the program on Fridays for 29 weeks. Entire classes, with classroom teachers, were bused to the site in Queens. In Staten Island, the program operated in the home school.

The special education program followed basically the same methodology as the parent Title I L.T.R.T.A. program. However, in the special education program, group sizes were smaller than in the regular program and entire classes with their classroom teachers participated in the program. Allowances were made for the students' short attention spans, with materials presented in a variety of ways. Extra assistance was provided for students with special difficulties to enable them to participate in all program activities.

The students participated in a diagnostic/prescriptive reading workshop and two separate reading-oriented arts workshops, which included painting, sculpture, drama, music, puppetry, printmaking, mixed media, mime, and drawing. The classroom teachers were assigned to one of the reading-oriented arts workshops to work with the artist teacher for one part of the day and to the reading workshop for the other part of the day.

---

*Approximately 900 special education students participated in the program; however, since the funding sources were different, the other student evaluations are discussed in a separate report. See Tobias, R., Reichman, F. and Francois, F. Title I/PSEN Reading and Math Services for the Handicapped, chapter III, pg. 31-43, Office of Educational Evaluation, New York City Public Schools, 1980-81.

The special education students participating in the program went on regular field trips to the cultural institutions associated with the program, as well as to other museums, cultural institutions, universities, and libraries. In addition, these students exhibited their art work along side that of the other Title I L.T.R.T.A. students in the annual Exhibition and Film Festival held at the School of Visual Arts.

The special education component followed the same model as the Title I L.T.R.T.A. with respect to teacher training and parent workshops.

EVALUATION RESULTS

The program objective of the special education component was for 60 percent of the students to master at least four instructional objectives at posttest which they had not mastered at pretest.

The Wisconsin Design Skill Development Test, forms P and Q, levels A, B, C and D, were used to assess mastery. The test is a criterion-referenced test of reading skills which is administered to students throughout the year on a pretest and posttest basis. Students are pretested during the beginning of the year to determine the areas and level of skills in which the student needs instruction. The reading teacher determines when a student is ready to take a posttest. The four skill areas emphasized in the program were comprehension, phonetic analysis, structural analysis, and vocabulary.

Special education students far surpassed the criterion for program success. The objective was for 60 percent of the students to pass at least four instructional objectives at posttest which they didn't pass at pretest. In fact, 88 percent of the students passed four objectives, 82 percent of the students passed at least five objectives, 53 percent, or one half, passed six objectives, and 35 percent of the students passed seven objectives.

V. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN L.T.R.T.A. STAFF AND CLASSROOM TEACHERS

COMMUNICATION OBJECTIVES

One of the long-standing aims of educators related to Title I pull-out programs (that is, where Title I instruction occurs outside the child's classroom) is to integrate Title I instruction with the classroom instructional program. In order for integration and exchange of information to occur, communication between staff members must take place. In 1980-1981, one of the goals of the L.T.R.T.A. program was to promote communication between the program and from sending school classes. The goals of the increased communications were the following:

1. to inform sending school teachers of L.T.R.T.A. activities and procedures;
2. to promote continuity of instruction and provide opportunities for teachers to reinforce the skills taught in the program; and
3. to enable program and classroom teachers to exchange relevant information about pupil behavior and academic progress.

In order to achieve these goals, the following information was sent on a regular basis to the classroom teachers by L.T.R.T.A. coordinators:

-- lists of specialized vocabulary words found in norm-referenced tests, as used and diagnosed in the L.T.R.T.A. program;

-- L.T.R.T.A. lesson plans;

-- lists of suggested activities which would reinforce the L.T.R.T.A. methodology;

-- diagnostic progress reports of students' reading needs and achievement twice a year;

-- reading-oriented art workshop progress reports twice a year; and

-- descriptions of field trips as they occurred.

In addition, classroom teachers were encouraged to send to L.T.R.T.A. staff lists of vocabulary words used in the classroom. Efforts were also made by the L.T.R.T.A. coordinators to meet the classroom teachers and/or to establish phone contact.

ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

In order to assess the impact of these efforts, a sample of classrooms was visited at the beginning and end of the program year. The criteria used to select classrooms was that each classroom sent at least five students to the program. In each case, the classroom teacher was sending students to the program for the first time. A total of 11 classrooms in three schools were observed for 45 minutes each. Four special education classes and seven regular classes were observed; classroom teachers were informally interviewed. A classroom observation form was designed to determine: 1) whether or not classroom instruction reflected the procedures and goals of the program; 2) whether or not classroom displays and materials reflected the program procedures; and 3) whether or not there were any direct references to L.T.R.T.A. on the part of the teachers or students(see Appendix A). During the visits, any observable changes that had occurred during the course of the year were noted and the evaluator discussed with classroom teachers any contacts they may have had with L.T.R.T.A. staff and/or program information.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS

At the end-of-the-year visit, teachers evidenced much greater knowledge of L.T.R.T.A. than they had during the first visit. Teachers described meeting with the program staff and receiving lesson plans and other written

materials. Several teachers said the materials were well designed and commented that the program staff were consistently available for assistance.

Evidence of carry-over to the sending school classroom was more apparent in special education classes, where entire classes and teachers participated in L.T.R.T.A. One special education teacher had an L.T.R.T.A. bulletin board displaying sculpture and painting vocabulary words. In another classroom the children decided to make small cut-out self portraits based on work they had done in L.T.R.T.A. Another special education teacher commented that there was natural carry-over into the classroom evidenced by the children's increased liking for music.

In the regular classrooms, the carry-over was not apparent. While teachers had received the materials sent and thought they were potentially very useful, they said it was somewhat difficult to carry over the program into their classrooms. The reason cited by several teachers was that only a portion of the class was participating and that referring to L.T.R.T.A. in their classroom might arouse envy among the non-participants. Two teachers specifically stated that they would prefer to have the whole class participate.

Two conclusions can be drawn from the classroom observations and discussions with classroom teachers.

1) The program achieved its goal with regard to informing sending school teachers about the L.T.R.T.A. activities and procedures, and promoted the exchange of information related to pupil progress and behavior. The L.T.R.T.A. staff appear to have made themselves available to classroom teachers for teacher-initiated discussions and arranged sessions in which L.T.R.T.A. staff could discuss program procedures, activities, and student progress.

2) Continuity of instruction between the program and sending school classrooms appears to be more feasible under the special education model, in which an entire class, along with the classroom teacher, participates in the program. Discussions with teachers revealed that special education teachers were able to promote such carry-over both because they were participants in the program and because it was a shared experience for the entire class. Teachers in regular classrooms were hesitant to carry over the program directly into the classroom because only a portion of their class participated. Whether or not the materials and discussions sent by the program will have a more far-reaching effect on the these teachers than could be observed in their classrooms is a matter of conjecture. One of the teachers, for example, said he would consider the procedures and information he received in future curriculum planning.

VI. IMPACT OF PROGRAM INVOLVEMENT IN THE NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK

BACKGROUND

In its role as a developer/demonstrator (D/D) site, the L.T.R.T.A. program receives funding from the National Diffusion Network* (N.D.N.) to provide training materials and technical assistance to schools and districts. The N.D.N. grant award has enabled the program to: develop training materials (curriculum guides, handbooks, lesson plans); conduct awareness workshops designed to disseminate information about the program to school districts interested in adoption; and develop management procedures to monitor the implementation of program adoptions. Through N.D.N. involvement, the L.T.R.T.A. developer/demonstrator has developed skills beyond its original strengths as an exemplary reading program.

This particular evaluation assessed the ways in which 1) N.D.N. funding interfaces with Title IV-C and Title I funding to promote the development of the program and 2) involvement in N.D.N. has affected New York City Public schools. The results may be useful to other school districts and program developers in showing how N.D.N. funding allows the development of expertise within the developer/demonstrator program and thereby helps the school system itself.

The evaluators identified three areas of N.D.N. impact on the school system: 1) the materials, management procedures, and staff expertise can provide New York City with a "turnkey" system for improving student reading achievement; 2) the program's credibility as a nationally identified "exemplary

*The National Diffusion Network is a U.S.O.E. supported, nation-wide system designed to help those involved in education acquire the materials and assistance they need to incorporate improved practices into their programs.

program" encourages cooperative networking with other New York City organizations, and 3) the high standards and visibility of the D/D site improve staff morale which in turn may affect student motivation.

MANAGEMENT, MATERIALS, AND STAFF EXPERTISE

Participation in N.D.N. has enabled L.T.R.T.A. staff to gain expertise in all phases of program dissemination and management. L.T.R.T.A. staff have identified the vital steps needed to operate a D/D site and refined these steps to provide effective service to adopters and potential adopters.

As a D/D site, L.T.R.T.A. is responsible for ensuring that school districts adopting the program retain the essential characteristics of L.T.R.T.A. while successfully adapting these basic functions to meet the individual needs of the school districts involved. This complex process is accomplished through a well-coordinated combination of personal contact and carefully designed materials.

The first step in the process is to make school disricts aware of the L.T.R.T.A. program. An "awareness" brochure and flyer provide information about the program's philosophy, essential components, and "track record". Districts adopting the program are provided with two days of intensive, pre-service training for participating staff. The training covers the program's unique diagnostic-prescriptive techniques and its integration of arts and reading-oriented arts workshops.

The D/D project director and teacher trainers provide on-going technical assistance . They help the program construct an evaluation design, select field trips, and develop a student exhibition. They provide feedback on curriculum design and monitor the program to ensure that all the essential components

are implemented appropriately. The collection of student achievement data by the adopter site is also monitored by the D/D site. At the end of the implementation year, L.T.R.T.A. provides the adopter site with an evaluation report of student achievement at the site, including when appropriate, recommendations for improving the student asessment process.

L.T.R.T.A.'s selection as one of the exemplary reading programs to be used in the system's Promotional Gates Program* may also be related to the program's N.D.N. participation and exemplary program status. National recognition of L.T.R.T.A. as a successful reading program made L.T.R.T.A. a natural choice for the Promotional Gates Program which will aim at improving the reading skills of children who have been retained in fourth and seventh grades due to low achievement. Because the L.T.R.T.A. program has established an effective system for dissemination of information, training personnel, and monitoring adoptions of the program, it is already equipped to help create effective replications.

Another way in which the New York City schools benefit from L.T.R.T.A. involvement is through adoptions of the program: 12 public schools and 13 non-public schools replicated L.T.R.T.A. over the past two years. These schools have become eligible for various types of funding, including replication grants, Title IV-C mini-grants, and Title I and Title III funding. In 1980-1981, adoptions in New York City reached over 500 students who have directly benefited from the L.T.R.T.A. program's Title IV-C and N.D.N. involvement.

---

*The program is a result of the policy which established minimum promotion standards for all students in grades kindergarten through nine. (See Chancellor's Regulations, June, 1980.)

NETWORKING WITH NEW YORK CITY CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

N.D.N. funding has helped in establishing associations with many cultural institutions, universities, and private corporations who have formed associations with L.T.R.T.A. because it is an exemplary program. These associations have resulted in program expansion and have benefited the school system in general, as exemplified below.

During the 1979-1980 and 1980-1981 school years, the program's annual performing arts festival was held at Macy's department store (Macy's City-kids). This activity provided an entree for further association between the Board of Education and Macy's. For example, through the Murjani Corporation, Macy's gave $3,500 in scholarships to eight L.T.R.T.A. students for summer day camp. Macy's Corporation also supported the Chancellor's drive to improve school attendance in 1981. The exposure that the program gained through these contacts increases the possibility of additional associations in the future.

N.D.N. recognition has also been instrumental in facilitating networks with the city's universities. In January, and in the summer of 1979, Fordham University offered a course in Learning to Read Through the Arts. The course introduced the L.T.R.T.A. methodology to New York City teachers and other participating educators and helped to generate interest in program adoptions. Other universities (e.g. New York University, the School of Visual Arts, and City College of the City of New York) have sent student teachers to observe the program, as part of field courses.

ASSESSMENT OF STAFF SKILLS AND MORALE

Another approach to determining the impact of N.D.N. participation on a school system is to assess how teachers are affected by it. When teachers

gain new skills or increase their motivation, the implementation of the program is strengthened.

To evaluate the impact of N.D.N. involvement on New York City school teachers implementing L.T.R.T.A., a questionnaire was developed which focused on the teachers' training, their contributions to training others and their performance and motivation. It was intended to assess the role of the L.T.R.T.A. instructional staff with regard to N.D.N. involvement. (See sample questionnaire, Appendix B.) The questionnaire were distributed to L.T.R.T.A. staff at a meeting in April, 1981. Fifty-three of the 84 instructional staff members returned completed questionnaires. Of these, 23 were special education staff members and 30 were regular staff members. Most of the staff thought that the dissemination materials, developed with N.D.N. funding, were helpful to them in their own training in L.T.R.T.A. At least 73 percent of the respondents found the staff training manual, curriculum guide, and sample materials useful.

Most of the respondents had contributed to one or more of the curriculum materials. All of the respondents who offered additional comments said contributing to the materials was meaningful in some way, including enhancing skills, clarifying ideas and goals, gaining self-confidence, and practicing communication ideas. (See results section of Appendix B.)

Nearly all of the respondents reported that outside visitors observed their workshops. These visitors included New York City principals and district superintendents, as well as evaluators and school personnel from other school systems. Forty-three percent of the respondents had 15 or more visitors during the year. Reactions to the visitors were generally quite favorable, and 40 percent of the respondents reported that visitors gave them the incentive to plan more carefully.

Over half of the respondents said that working in a developer/demonstrator site had a strong effect on their performance and 47 percent said it had a strong effect on their morale.

CONCLUSIONS

N.D.N. involvement has provided the L.T.R.T.A. program with a method for developing materials and training procedures which benefits the New York City school system. Through N.D.N. sponsored activities, L.T.R.T.A. has developed program management skills which are used with the Promotional Gates Program, schools which adopt L.T.R.T.A. become eligible for federal funding, and associations with private and public institutions in New York City have been established.

Information gathered from teacher questionnaires indicates that N.D.N. funded materials are a valuable resource to teachers implementing the program. Teaching at a developer/demonstrator site has affected teacher morale and performance, providing staff members with motivation to plan curriculum more carefully.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the assessments of student achievement, site visits, interviews with program staff, and feedback about N.D.N. participation.

1. Since L.T.R.T.A. has been so successful, it should be recycled and expanded to serve more students.

2. Due to its success with special education students, the L.T.R.T.A. program should continue to serve these students on a city-wide basis, with a site in each borough.

3. Carry-over of program goals from the program to the sending school classroom appears most feasible when entire classes, along with sending school classroom teachers, participate. It is recommended therefore, that entire classes and classroom teachers participate in the program.

4. Brooklyn has a large waiting list of students eligible for the program. Because of the size of the borough and the number of eligible children waiting to participate, it is recommended that ways be investigated to serve these children.

5. As a developer/demonstrator site, L.T.R.T.A. staff have gained experience and expertise in all phases of program dissemination and management. N.D.N. involvement has been found to have a positive impact on the program. Further evaluative efforts should focus on identifying characteristics of successful program adoptions. This type of evaluation may further the city's efforts to disseminate successful educational programs, as in the Promotional Gates Program.

Also, the school system should draw on the expertise of L.T.R.T.A. staff as a valuable resource in efforts to improve reading skills, disseminate information, and transfer successful practices.

6. L.T.R.T.A. has been very successful with special education pupils who can benefit from innovative and individualized instructional methodologies. Bilingual students also need the benefit of methodologies which are innovative and frequently not offered in the regular classroom. Therefore, it is suggested that the L.T.R.T.A. administrators consider including bilingual pupils in the program.

7. It is suggested that L.T.R.T.A. administrators present their model of the ways in which the program staff work in the schools to the nonpublic school administrators in order to determine the feasibility of L.T.R.T.A. in the nonpublic schools. (The L.T.R.T.A. Program could be supported with private, Title IV-C, and/or Title I funds.)

8. The time and energy spent by the L.T.R.T.A. staff establishing and transfering sites in the beginning of the year causes real concern which should be seriously addressed by administrators in L.T.R.T.A. and the Division of Curriculum and Instruction. Solutions to this problem should be identified and considered for implementation (for example, securing space for more than one year, maintaining neighborhood schools which might otherwise be closed down because of under-utilization, or, when possible, identifying schools and setting up new sites at the end of the school year).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

December, 1980

Learning to Read Through the Arts
Classroom Observation Form

Observer: _____ Date: _____

Time in: _____

Time out: _____

Borough: _____

School: _____

Class: _____

Teacher's name: _____

Children present/on register: _____

Children participating in program: _____

Lesson(s) Observed	Time Period From:	To:
_____	_____	
_____	_____	
_____	_____	
_____	_____	

Remarks:

I. How does classroom instruction reflect the methodology and goals of Learning to Read Through the Arts?

A. Does the reading lesson observed integrate reading with other subject areas?

Yes_____
No_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Does the lesson make use of any arts experience (music, drawings, drama, etc.)?

Yes_____
No_____

Comments:_____

_____

C. If yes, are written materials (e.g., song sheets, play directions, etc.) used as part of arts experience?

Yes_____
No_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

D. Are specialized vocabulary words used in instruction?

Yes_____
No_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

E. Are norm-referenced vocabulary words used in instruction?
Yes_____
No_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

F. Are teacher-made materials used in instruction?
Yes_____
No_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

II. Do classroom displays and materials reflect program methodology?

A. Is student art work or writing displayed in the classroom?
Yes_____
No_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Are there reading materials (e.g., books, magazines, posters, signs) other than basal readers which reflect arts or other subject area contents?
Yes_____
No_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

C. Is there a place where students can record their own stories, activities, ideas, etc. (e.g., individual journals, experience chart)?

Yes_____
No_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

D. Are norm-referenced words on display?

Yes_____
No_____

Comments_____

_____

_____

_____

E. Are specialized vocabulary words on display?

Yes_____
No_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

F. Are teacher-made materials on display in the classroom (worksheets, charts, etc.)?

Yes_____
No_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

III. Miscellaneous

A. Discuss any other ways that classroom teachers are observed to use the Learning to Read Through the Arts curriculum or methodology. _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Discuss any ways that students in the program are observed to use the Learning to Read Through the Arts curriculum or methodology._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Describe any direct references to Learning to Read Through the Arts (e.g., mention of field trip experience) on the part of teachers or students. _____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK:

L.T.R.T.A. STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Date: _____

Staff position (check one)
Coordinator _____
Workshop Liaison _____
Artist Teacher _____
Reading Teacher _____
Special Education: Yes ___ No ____

1. Which materials were helpful to you when you received training in the LTRTA program methodology? Check the appropriate items.

___Staff training manual
___Curriculum guide-reading lessons
___Sample materials (e.g., master journals)
___Slides
___Other _____

2. If you have had input in the development of lesson plans and materials used in training others, please indicate below what your specific involvement has been.

___Contribution to curriculum guide (e.g., lesson plans)
___Contribution to staff training handbook
___Contribution to dissemination materials (e.g., brochures, slides, video-tape)
___Materials to be used for revised editions of above and new guides
___Other _____
___No specific involvement

A. If this involvement has been meaningful to you as an educator please indicate in what ways it has been meaningful.

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Have you had visitors from outside the program observe you in the classroom?

   Yes ___ No ___

A. If yes, which of the following personnel have visited your classroom site. Check off as many as apply.

___NYC teachers
___NYC school principals
___NYC district superintendents
___Evaluators
___School personnel from outside N.Y.C.
___Other _____

B. Approximately how many visitors have you had during the course of the year?

   1-3___ 4-6 ___ 7-10 ___ 10-15 ___ 15 ___ None ___

C. What was your reaction to having visitors at your site? Check off as many statements as apply.

___Gave me incentive to plan more carefully
___Enjoyed sharing experience with colleagues
___Increased my enthusiasm for the program
___Had no significant impact
___Children enjoyed the experience
___Other _____

4. Do you feel that working in a Developer/Demonstrater site of the National Diffusion Network affects your performance in any of the following ways?

   A. Performance/Productivity (circle the appropriate response):

      1. Little effect 2. Some effect 3. Strong effect

   B. Morale (circle the appropriate response):

      1. Little effect 2. Some effect 3. Strong effect

If you have any additional comments to support your responses to the questions above, please indicate below:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your cooperation.

N.D.N. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Described below are the responses given by L.T.R.T.A. staff to each question on the N.D.N. Questionnaire. The special education teachers' and regular teachers' questionnaire responses are discussed together, since there did not appear to be significant differences between responses of staff members working in the two different areas. Fifty-three of the 84 instructional staff members returned completed questionnaires.

Question 1: Which materials were helpful to you when you received training in the L.T.R.T.A program methodology? (N=53)

Materials	Number	%
Staff training manual	41	77%
Curriculum guide - reading lessons	42	79%
Sample materials	39	73%
Slides	14	26%

In addition, some respondents wrote that orientation sessions, oral presentations, samples of children's work and discussions with artist teachers were helpful. Seven respondents wrote that in-service meetings were helpful.

The second question asked staff members to indicate their role in the development of materials used to train others. There were several write-in answers to this question, with respondents indicating involvement in staff training, tape and slide development, conducting N.D.N. workshops, and demonstrations for visitors.

Question 2: If you have had input in the development of lesson plans and materials used in training others, please indicate what your specific involvement has been. (N=53)

Material	Number*	%
Curriculum guides	24	45%
Staff training handbook	12	22%
Dissemination materials	15	30%
Revised editions of forthcoming guides	17	32%

*Multiple responses reported.

When asked to describe how involvement in curriculum development and training was meaningful to them:

--nine said it enhanced their skills;
--six said it helped them clarify their ideas and goals;
--three said it helped them gain self confidence; and
--two said it gave them practice communicating.

Other respondents said contributions were meaningful because of the "team involvement," because they had "pride in their work", because "it added to a resume", and because the program "provided an important art experience for children."

Question three asked if the staff member had visitors from outside the program observe his/her workshops. As a Developer/Demonstrator site, one of the functions of the N.D.N. involvement is to provide visitors with a model of the program in action. Fifty-two out of the 53 respondents answering this question said that outside visitors had observed their site. Forty-six, or 86 percent, of the respondents said that N.Y.C. teachers had observed their classroom. Forty-two, or 79 percent, said N.Y.C. principals had visited their

classroom. Twenty-one, or 40 percent, said N.Y.C. district superintendents had visited their classroom. Thirty-six, or 68 percent, had been observed by evaluators. Twenty-seven, or 51 percent, had been observed by school personnel outside of N.Y.C., from school superintendents to classroom teachers. Other visitors included: special education supervisors, art therapists, artists, college supervisors, parents, and education students.

The next question, answered by 48 respondents, asked how many visitors had come to the workshops. The results indicated that:

--three or 5% had one to three visitors;
--nine or 19% had four to six visitors;
--six or 13% had seven to ten visitors;
--seven or 15% had 11 to 15 visitors; and
--23 or 48% had 15+ visitors.

Staff members were asked to indicate their reaction to having visitors at the site. Fifty respondents answered the question.

--Twenty-one (40%) indicated that having visitors gave them the incentive to plan more carefully.

--Forty-three (81%) indicated that they enjoyed sharing experiences with colleagues.

--Twenty-eight (53%) indicated that having visitors increased their enthusiasm for the program.

--Six (11%) indicated that having visitors had no significant impact.

--Twenty-seven (51%) indicated that the children enjoyed the experience.

Other responses included one comment that having visitors "kept everyone on their toes;" another that they worked as usual; and a third that it provided input and guidance for teaching.

Question four asked if working at a developer/demonstrator site affected teaching performance. The responses were as follows:

--five (9%) said there was little effect;
--20 (38%) said there was some effect; and
--28 (53%) said there was strong effect.

Asked if working at a developer/demonstrator site affected their morale; L.T.R.T.A. staff answered af follows:

--six (11%) said there was little effect;
--20 (38%) said there was some effect;
--25 (47%) said there was strong effect; and
--two (4%) gave no response.